

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIG. 2B. These sheets replace the original sheet for FIGS. 2B. In this figure, a table with textual labels has been added, as suggested by the Office Action.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet and Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. The specification and drawings have been amended in response to objections. No claims have been amended. Claims 1 - 28 are currently pending.

#### **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 – 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Sullivan, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,557 (“Sullivan”), in view of Cosic, U.S. Patent No. 7,117,225 (“Cosic”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because neither Sullivan nor Cosic, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests “deleting at least one of said plurality of items from said universal data store in response to said change [in a relationship],” as required by independent claims 9 and 25. Independent claims 1, 13, and 18 include similar claim language and are likewise patentable over Sullivan and Cosic.

The Office Action relies on Sullivan to teach the deleting of items from a data store. Sullivan provides a system that “facilitates the deinstallation of files represented by a particular suite window or icon.” Sullivan, col. 3, lines 53-55. Specifically, Sullivan discloses a method to delete all files associated with an application once a user chooses to uninstall that application. Sullivan, col. 11, lines 3-33. As explained by the Office Action, Sullivan teaches that:

The user could similarly choose to deinstall the application and remove the icon from the display. In this instance all files recorded in the storage element that are associated with the icon would be deleted and the icon itself would be deleted.

Office Action at p. 5 (citing Sullivan, col. 11, lines 3-33). As illustrated by this citation, Sullivan merely teaches deleting a group of related files in response to a user's request that an application be uninstalled.

While Sullivan discloses deleting files once a user chooses to uninstall an application, Sullivan is silent as to techniques for deleting files when the relationships among the files have changed. Indeed, the deletion of files in Sullivan is triggered by a user input ordering an application to be uninstalled. Sullivan, however, never suggests this user input yields a change in the relationships among the files. In fact, Sullivan selects the file for deletion by relying on a static association with the to-be-deleted application, not some change in a relationship.

In contrast to Sullivan's deleting of all files associated with an application, independent claim 9 requires "deleting at least one of said plurality of items from said universal data storage device" in response to a change in a "relationship between a selected item and one or more of the items." Independent claims 1, 13, 18, and 25 contain similar language. As such, neither Sullivan nor Cosic, either alone or in combination teaches or suggests each and every element of the present independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 13, 18, and 25 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants also submit that dependent claims 2 - 8, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 10 - 12, which depend from claim 9, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9. Applicants submit that dependent claims 14- 17, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13.

Applicants also submit that dependent claims 19 - 24, which depend from claim 18, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18. Applicants submit that dependent claims 26 - 28, which depend from claim 25, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 25.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 28 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

***/Robert H. Reckers/***

Robert Reckers  
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108  
Phone: 816/474-6550  
Fax: 816-421-5547